REMARKS

Claims 10 and 20 to 37 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable for the following reasons and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Rejections of Claims 20 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action submits that claim 20 recites the limitation of "said grids" in line 10 without antecedent basis.

Claim 20 has been amended such that antecedent basis has been provided for the features of the claim. Applicants respectfully submit that through the amendment to claim 20, the rejection has been rendered moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claim 20.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20 and therefore includes the features of amended claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 also provides proper antecedent basis for the features of the claims. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claim 21.

II. Rejection of Claims 20 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baltzer et al. (5,967,336) in view of Riddle et al. (5,927,511). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20 and 21 are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 relates to a screen assembly. Claim 20 recites the features comprising a frame, spaced side end members on said frame, ends of said side members, first and second spaced end members at said frame at said ends of said side members, openings between said side members and said first and second end members, a screen on said frame overlying said openings, a plurality of spaced ribs extending between and joining said spaced side members, upper edges on said ribs, and lower concave edges on said ribs wherein said openings are oriented in rows extending crosswise of

6

said side members wherein a plurality of rows of openings are located between at least certain grids. Claim 20 has been amended, without prejudice herein, to recite the feature of recessed indentations in lower surfaces of said spaced side end members. Support for the amendment to claim 20 is found, for example, in originally filed claim 10.

Applicants first note that the rejection provided for claims 20 and 21 is an anticipation rejection. Claim 20 requires the feature of lower concave edges on said ribs wherein said openings are oriented in rows extending crosswise of said side members wherein a plurality of rows of openings are located between at least certain grids. The Office Action admits that Baltzer does not teach this design. <u>Office Action page 3</u>. As the Office Action admits that a single reference does not contain the features claimed, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

This notwithstanding, applicants have amended claim 20 to recite the features considered patentable in claim 10 as described in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that as claim 20 contains the allowable subject matter provided in claim 10, applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is allowable over the cited art.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20 and therefore includes all the features of claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is patentable for at least the reasons provided above in relation to claim 20.

III.   **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants acknowledge that claims 10 and 22 to 34 are patentable.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims of the present application are now in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 9/27/06

John M. Vereb
Reg. No. 48,912

One Broadway.
New York, NY 10004

(212) 425-7200 (telephone)

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

8